

GLENN W. PFEIL

Publisher

REID L. BUNDY Managing Editor

Wednesday, November 18, 1964

Our New Sister City

The dabbling of Torrance into the "Sister City" program, which reached a high point early in 1960 with the visit here of Sitki Bilgin, then mayor of the Sister City of Konya, Turkey, has reached another plateau with the selection of Guatemala City to be Torrance's second "Sister City."

While a shifting political climate in Turkey has caused fluctuations in this city's dialogue with its ancient sister in that country, City Council members and others have indicated that Guatemala City offers a far more suitable atmosphere in which to carry on the people-to-people program envisioned by Dwight Eisenhower when he was President.

It sounds good, the theory is tremendous, and if carried out properly, such relationships could be solid building blocks for peace.

We wonder, though, how much the desire for a workable sister city program is motivated by a genuine hope for better international understanding.

Is international peace the goal . . . or is the program an opening for a handful to feed their egos with community publicity, tax-paid junkets, and wheel-spinning on an international level?

There were many reasons why the Konya affiliation cooled, most of them traceable to the climate there, not here.

But, we're not so sure about a Latin American affiliation. While our view may raise howls of protest in some quarters, particularly among those who might think they're fooling some of the community's residents, we regard the present decision a contrived vehicle for self-aggrandizement at the public's expense.

Our view won't alter the fact that Torrance has selected Guatemala City for a cultural exchange, and it probably shouldn't. We don't like to condemn what should be a fine effort toward international understanding before it gets off the ground.

We have heard our share of grandiose schemes before, however, and we're suddenly "from Missouri."

We stand ready to be convinced, but the performance had better be good.

Opinions of Others

When we sit back and do not express our viewpoint or raise objection to ideas that we do not believe in, we are hastening the time when we will not have the privilege of expressing our views. If we fall into the habit of taking the path of least resistance, or if we fail to say no when we feel no is the right answer, even if it is not the popular one, then we are saying that the ideals that our forefathers died for were not important. Express yourself! A nation gets the kind of government it deserves! Let us deserve government "by the PEOPLE!"—*Toppenish (Wash.) Review.*

America, if it is to once become solvent and sane, must destroy the philosophy all business is evil and must be taxed even beyond the hurting stage, as punishment for welfare state schemes, and for keeping alive its own government-sponsored competition—*Washburn (N. D.) Leader-News.*

There are so many things about the medicare proposal which trouble the thinking individual. Is it right to provide free medical care to those who can afford the best care? Shouldn't any medical care be offered on the basis of need? And if free medical care becomes a right of every American, can we stop there. Will not the next logical step be to provide free legal service, free utilities, free food?—*Ocala (Fla.) Star-Banner.*

NEWS SPARKS by James Dorais

Labor Leaders Lick New Wounds After Elections

Goldwater Republicans and Salinger Democrats aren't alone in licking their wounds in California. The leaders of organized labor placed their reputation for political whammy on the line in all-out efforts to defeat two Propositions on the state ballot—Propositions 14 and 17—and were roundly repudiated by the voters.

While the two Propositions had nothing in common, their victory in each case, proved once again that when bread-and-butter labor issues are not involved, the state AFL-CIO leadership cannot deliver the votes of rank and file union members, let alone influence the decisions of non-union voters.

Proposition 14 was many things to many people—but whatever it was, it was not a labor issue. To its opponents, it was a moral issue, and the drive for its defeat took on the proportions of a holy crusade. Its supporters benefited from the widespread feeling that the civil rights movement has broken

too many of the ground rules of political action acceptable in a democracy. The active participation of religious leaders in the campaign against the Proposition probably hurt, rather than helped, the anti-Proposition 14 cause, because of the deep seated American tradition of separation of church and state.

In any case, the prominent part played by California's union leadership in the campaign against the Proposition failed to convince union members, as evidenced by its passage in such important union and Democratic areas as San Francisco, where President Johnson completely overruled Senator Goldwater.

In one sense, Proposition 17, the railroad anti-featherbedding measure, could be considered a labor issue, as its opposition stemmed from the railroad brotherhoods. The state AFL-CIO leadership took up the brotherhoods' cause, and made every effort to persuade liberal Democratic officehold-



HERE AND THERE by Royce Brier

What Happened to Castro In the Kremlin Shakeup?

The impact of the Moscow change on the future of Cuba has not been extensively discussed, and it is worth some thought.

When Fidel Castro broke with the United States some four years ago, he had what appeared to be a conspicuous ace in the hole. Comrade Khrushchev had ever said the Soviet Union would support "liberation" movements everywhere, and when Castro declared himself a Communist, Khrushchev had nowhere to move but to his side.

Cuba had acquired the bulk of its foreign exchange by sale of the bulk of its sugar to the United States, and had always depended on the United States for most of its industrial imports.

Hence the gradual American boycott of Cuba preceding the sharp 1962 crisis and blockade, hurt. But Cas-

tro fancied he could easily assuage the hurt by trade with his new-found friend.

This was a delusion because the Soviet Union had to barter, not exchange dollars, for Cuba's sugar crop. This barter involved industrial goods, presumed to replace the lost American imports.

But this was absurd, because the Soviet Union lacks the industrial surpluses, the shipping distance is long and arduous, and in any case most Cuban factories, including sugar refineries, are American-equipped.

Dr. Castro visited Moscow a couple of times, and was wined and dined, the full red carpet, at least the first time.

But Castro's Cuba is left high and dry by the change-

over in Moscow. It is as final as if Khrushchev had dropped dead.

Castro has no guarantee the new regime ostensibly headed by Brezhnev will be as sentimental over Cuba as was Khrushchev, or that it will continue the Khrushchev policy. It depends on what the new leaders think they can get, how they judge Cuba as asset or liability, how much they are preoccupied by problems, much closer at home.

The new leaders may be downright indifferent, or more cozy than was Khrushchev. Castro doesn't know, the world doesn't know, and the Kremlin may not know at the moment. But Castro better get over there and sound it out at the first opportune moment—if one arises. One guesses that psychologically it won't be a pleasant journey.

BOOKS by William Hogan

Novelist Priestly Scans Ancient Stories of Time

Wrote Carl Sandburg: "Time is a sandpile we run our fingers on." And H. D.

Thoreau: "Time is but the stream I go fishing in."

J. B. Priestley, who (as time is measured) has just turned 70, has written a book-length novel in the great enigma, "Man and Time." Priestley is not an astronomer, but a professional man of the imagination, a dramatist and novelist. His perception and discussion on the complex subject of time is personal, literate, often charming. Yet he is able to project Jung's theories, or Einstein's, clearly, economically and in an urbane fashion as he guides us through historical time, the philosophy and measurement of it, depositing us at last on the threshold of the future.

Printed in Holland, the book is so laced with illustrations that it might be titled "A Pictorial History of Man and Time." Some 400 pictures attempt to provide a broad visual account of the subject. For instance: a print from a 15th Century treatise on morality titled "The Clock of Wisdom," depicting a feudal household admiring the splendor of their master's vast, weight-driven clock; or again, a painting by Monet ("Les Coquelicots") which suggests that, to the very young, leisurely summer days may seem to be outside Time. Altogether an amazing trinket that falls into no standard category, except that late fall publishing catch-all, the

gift book (Doubleday; \$14.95).

The English writer, H. V. Morton ("A Traveler in Rome"), is a tourist in the grand old style. "The train in which I was traveling was the most elegant in Europe, probably, I should say, in the world. It has a name and a voice. The name, Settebello—the beautiful seven—is that of an Italian card game in which the winning card is the Seven of Diamonds . . ."

Here, Morton is en route to Lombardy; to Milan and its Cathedral; to La Scala, to the tomb of Verdi. Through more than 600 pages of his new book, "A Traveler in Italy," he remains the enthusiast, the scholar, the gentleman in first class.

While I am more comfortable and in tune with things when V. S. Pritchett is the tour master on these armchair forays, Morton is certainly an informed and indefatigable barker during this complete cultural investigation of the republic. He attacks it all with the doggedness of an infantry sergeant, and my feet began to ache when he suggested one more tramp through Perugia, city of Popes and conclaves; another Medici palace; just one more Bernini marble; a final tomb, if we don't mind—and this of one who was merely an honorary saint. Thorough, in the 19th Century manner—but where is La Dolce Vita? (Dodd, Mead; \$10).

AFTER HOURS by John Morley

Red Army Really Behind Latest Kremlin Politics

Who got Khrushchev and why—and an assessment of his successors, Leonid Brezhnev and Aleksei Kosygin and their supporters—unfolds much of the mystery and speculation of the past few weeks.

Khrushchev was a powerful, colorful and dramatic Communist leader. He maneuvered satellites, bullied the West and propagandized Soviet scientific achievements which brought his country at least on a par with the U. S. in the eyes of the world. In space he attained important firsts, and their propaganda value alone cannot be overestimated.

He both impressed and agonized the Communist world. He outfoxed the West from Cuba to Korea. He placed his rockets with Castro to force a deal on the removal of Jupiter from Turkey. He beat us at the Bay of Pigs.

He forced us to commit major forces in Korea, to lose 38,000 U. S. personnel and billions of our wealth, a fantastic price just to hold the status quo at the 38th parallel.

As a custodian of Communist prestige, one must admit he outshone Stalin.

Stalin achieved for the Kremlin an unchallenged monolithic control of the Communist world. But the world had changed since he took over from Lenin in 1924 . . . and greatly so since his death in 1953. It was inevitable that no Soviet leader could keep 87 world Communist parties indefinitely under his thumb.

So what happened? Did he resign, or was he ousted?

There is no happy hunting ground for Soviet leaders. There is no proof that any of them ever resigned. They are murdered, ousted and disgraced. For communism breeds conspiracy, tyranny, deception and ruthlessness. It's in the viscera and the germ cell of every die-hard Red.

Like all his predecessors, Khrushchev was undermined by his comrades, by the same power struggle that catapulted him to the premiership after Beria killed Stalin.

He first maneuvered Marshal Georgi Zhukov to get the support of the Red Army. He made him secretary of defense, raised army salaries, and agreed to remove the Communist political commissars who were spying on the armed forces. When he conquered the opposition—Molotov, Bulganin, Kaganovich, Malenkov—he canned Zhukov.

Khrushchev made blunders. The rift between Russia and Red China was not one of them. He could not permit Peking to challenge the power of the Soviet Union without a fight. There is nothing to indicate that Brezhnev-Kosygin will deal with Chou En-Lai as an equal. They may patch some things up, but they cannot abdicate power to Red China and survive.

In our opinion the Red Army called the shots against Khrushchev. He violated the agreement by quietly restoring the Communist commissars. He reduced the strength of the armed forces. He cut back weaponry in favor of civilian goods. He never restored the prestige of the military as it was under Zhukov.

Brezhnev and Kosygin were both Khrushchev men, and both were in line to succeed him. He trusted them. But they were forced to depose him. To have refused the army would prove fatal. The power play came from the army, not from the party. A purge trial for Khrushchev is likely soon. He will be denounced, as he denounced Stalin. But the Red army will pull the strings, not the civilian Communist leaders.

The army used the excuses of crop failures, the rift with Red China, the

personality cult, nepotism—as in the case of son-in-law Adzhubei—and the rest.

In our opinion these are but window dressing. Certainly not important enough to depose such a powerful man as Khrushchev.

His ousting will hasten the deterioration of the monolithic power of the Kremlin. It will increase the prestige of Red China. It will demoralize communism abroad and increase the pressure from within the satellite world to go it alone. It will follow a period of divisiveness and indeci-

sion in the USSR and a new power struggle from within the ranks.

In the meantime, the disgraced and disgruntled Stalinists are waiting on the sidelines for that one big chance that will restore them to power.

For the U.S. and the West the ousting of Khrushchev is both good and bad: good for the weakening of the Soviet hold on world communism, but bad for the rising power of Red China and the coming buildup of the Red army arsenal, now that the army again calls the signals.

Our Man Hoppe

Russians Are Un-American

By Arthur Hoppe

What went on behind the mysterious walls of the Kremlin? What strange forces coalesced? What plots were hatched? What devious machinations, we wonder, lay behind the overthrow of Mr. Khrushchev?

But how can we Americans, accustomed to our open and aboveboard free-enterprise system, ever hope to fathom the secrecy-shrouded conspiracies of these inscrutable Muscovite rulers—men whose very thought processes are so foreign to our way of life?

And yet, as the days pass, a picture of the scene vaguely emerges. And the clearer it grows, the more unbelievable it becomes to those of us who know only the straightforward American way of getting things done.

SCENE: A walnut-paneled conference room. A dozen executives around the long, gleaming table. The chair at one end is empty.

Mr. Brezhnev: In the absence of our beloved chairman . . .

Mr. Kosygin: Is he on vacation again? I certainly don't mean to criticize him, not for a minute, but didn't he and the wife just take a week up in the Katskills last month?

Mr. Suslov: Well, I'm sure no one would want to accuse him of intentionally shirking his responsibilities. Not intentionally. In all charity, we must remember that he's not getting any younger.

Mr. Brezhnev: Now, just a minute, gentlemen. As you know, I owe my position today to our chairman and I feel it is my duty to defend him in his absence. After all, his burdens have been very heavy lately, what with his abject failures in the world wheat market, his total inability to reach a settlement with our partners in Asia, his complete loss of control of our European branches, his . . .

Mr. Kosygin: Your loyalty to our chairman is to be commended and I share it fully. However, we mustn't forget the loyalty we owe to the principles of sound management. Personally, I've long felt we should adopt a Compulsory Retirement Plan on reaching the age of . . . How old is he now?

Mr. Brezhnev: You mean for his own good. Yes, I, too, feel he should spend his declining years without a host of problems on his once-sound mind. And seeing you put it that way, I second your motion.

Mr. Kosygin (nervously): What motion? Don't put me on record as making any motion to . . .

Mr. Brezhnev: The eyes have it. Gentlemen, you are to be congratulated on the deep concern you have shown for the health and well-being of our beloved chairman. Miss Kropotkin, have maintenance scrape him off the building directory.

Mr. Kosygin (worriedly): Who's going to break the good news to him?

Mr. Brezhnev: It won't be necessary. I'm sure that on his return he'll realize at once there's been a shake-up in top management. You see, I've already changed the lock on the executive washroom.

Aren't such methods unbelievable? Especially to those who believe the Russians are some inexplicable breed apart? Indeed, the whole thing proves once again the eternal truth of those simple, homey lines by that unforgettable poet, Mr. Edgar Whatshisname: "Folks are folks the world o'er," he wrote. "So don't trust nobody."

Morning Report:

If there's a time for everything, Senator Carl T. Curtis of Nebraska feels this is no time to decide what to do about the Republican party. He feels we should wait until "after the holidays." He's right.

People have more important things on their minds right now—like Christmas shopping. All of us patriotic citizens are willing to save the country and save the world, too, on the first Tuesday in November. But we've done our duty.

If the Republican statesmen want to save their party in private, they can do it now. But after holding their campaign pretty much to themselves, maybe they are ready for more widespread participation.

Abe Mellinkoff